

DEC 27 2006

Application No. 09/911,522

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

As suggested by the Office Action, Figures 2-4 are amended to add reference numbers.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERDEC 27 2006
Application No. 09/911,522REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending. By this Amendment, no claims are canceled, no claims are amended, and claims 21-25 are added.

Claims 1, 8, 9, 12, 13, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in light of Wu (US 6,553,364) in view of Klein et al. ("Klein")(US 6704729 B1). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully points out that Klein does not disclose obtaining a candidate database listing and acquiring a listing of a plurality of qualified databases from that candidate listing. The cited portions of Klein disclose: "In addition to having other categories as a child, a node may, as shown for node 122, have associated child web sites 'http://www.startrekker.net/movies.htm' 137 and 'http://www.trekdoc.com'." Klein apparently merely disclosed a static arrangement of parent-child nodes, not a listing of candidate databases for further processing to determine qualified databases.

Applicant respectfully points out that Klein apparently does not disclose acquiring a listing of qualified databases from a list of candidate databases by matching the candidate databases to a plurality of areas of subject areas of information. "In information stores where the number of nodes having relevant information is extremely large, such as the Internet, providing a cohesive, intelligent, and organized display of the search results becomes extremely important to the success of a user traversing the store to find relevant information." (See Klein: column 1, line 66 – column 2, line 4). Furthermore, Klein even specifies the benefits of this arrangement with the use of hyperlinks. "Displaying a matching node along with its relative nodes is even more useful in the context of the Internet, where related nodes and matching nodes may be displayed as a hypertext transfer protocol (http) link or a hyperlink. Therefore, Klein merely discloses a display of search results based on subject areas of information including hyperlinks, not determining a list of qualified databases based on subject areas of information.

Applicant respectfully points out that Wu does not disclose acquiring a collection of responsive content from a plurality of qualified databases. Instead, Wu discloses the use of a pre-defined list of responsive context. "The documents described in the main example herein are records in a search database. The search database is organized as a hierarchical structure of

Application No. 09/911,522

categories and site references. The structure might be automatically generated, but in the embodiment known as the Yahoo! search database, the categories and site references are placed in appropriate locations in the hierarchy by an editorial staff using the experience and suggestions from site submitters.” (See Wu, column 3, lines 58-65). The portions of Wu cited by the Office Action merely disclose submission of a query, and retrieving results from the query, not determining responsive content. Therefore, Wu does not disclose determining a collection of responsive content from a plurality of qualified databases. Wu instead discloses a search engine that operates on a pre-defined structure of responsive content.

With respect to specific features noted in the Office Action for the claims depending on claim 1, these issues are not commented on further here because they are presently moot given the above analysis, although applicants do not acquiesce to the arguments presented relevant to these features. As such, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-14.

Furthermore, the rejection of claim 2 is respectfully traversed. The Office Action admits that neither Wu nor Klein disclose an inclusion or an exclusion list. The Office Action instead relies on Ferguson et al. (“Ferguson”, US 6,237,011). However, in contrast to the Office Actions assertion, Ferguson does not disclose obtaining an inclusion list or obtaining an exclusion list. “The first filter type generates an inclusion list. The inclusion list may provide a user with an indication that the category criteria associated with that category are too restrictive.” (See Ferguson, column 9, lines 1-4). And “The second filter type generates an exclusion list. The exclusion list may provide the user with an indication that the category criteria associated with that category are not restrictive enough...” (See Ferguson, column 9, lines 6-12). Therefore, Ferguson does not disclose obtaining an exclusion or inclusion list to be used for a step of acquiring responsive content, the Ferguson inclusion and exclusion lists that indicate to a user that category criteria are too restrictive or not restrictive enough as part of search results. For at least those reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of claim 2.

With respect to the rejection of claim 16, the Office Action states: “Claim 16 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 1.” As discussed above, applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action’s interpretation of Wu and Klein. As a

Application No. 09/911,522

result, applicant respectfully asserts the Wu and Klein do not disclose all elements of claim 16 as previously discussed with respect to claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that Applicant is unable to find in Wu or Klein any disclosure of databases that provide a dynamic response to a specific query. Wu and Klein are apparently only directed towards static databases. For at least those reasons stated above, the rejection of claim 16 is respectfully traversed.

With respect to specific features noted in the Office Action for the claims depending on claim 16, these issues are not commented on further here because they are presently moot given the above analysis, although applicants do not acquiesce to the arguments presented relevant to these features. As such, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17-20.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in light of Redfern (US 6,078,914) in view of Christal et al. (hereinafter "Christal, Pub. No.: US 2001/0056414 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, applicant respectfully points out that, contrary to the assertion of the Office Action, that Redfern does not disclose a computer system having a storage means for retention and recall of data communicated by or to at least one other computer. The cited portions of Redfern merely disclose that a copy of an information source is retrieved. Redfern apparently merely discloses the process by which the search system processes results to reduce redundancies and ranking those results based on relevancy. Redfern apparently makes no mention of storage for retention and recall of data.

Second, applicant respectfully points out that Redfern does not disclose characterizing the documents resulting from a user query. In contrast, Redfern apparently merely discloses a selection means to examine and rank each information source, and to identify portions of those sources that are relevant to the user's query. Applicant respectfully asserts that characterizing includes evaluating documents by categorizing as recited in newly added claim 21, and/or evaluating documents using parametric information lists as recited in newly added claim 22. Therefore, applicant respectfully asserts that the examining, ranking, and identifying of relevant portions disclosed in Redfern is not characterizing as recited in claim 15. For at least those reasons stated above, the rejection of claim 15 is respectfully traversed.

Application No. 09/911,522

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,



Brad Pedersen
Registration No. 32,432

Customer No. 24113
Patterson, Thuent, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.
4800 IDS Center
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100
Telephone: (612) 349-5774